REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-22 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 18-20 are independent. Claims 21 and 22 have been added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-10, 14-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Saeki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,078,727 (hereinafter "Saeki"). Claims 11-13, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki in view of Moriyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,004 (hereinafter "Moriyama"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of steps including "creating and recording an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object for pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 6 recites a combination of steps including "recording an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object for pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 10 recites a combination of steps including "reading an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 15 recites a combination of elements including "control means for creating an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object for pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 18 recites a combination of elements including "control means... controlling said reading means to read an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 19 recites a combination of elements including "a controller to create an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object for pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Independent claim 20 recites a combination of elements including "a controller to control said pickup to read an index number of a first stream object unit of each stream object read by said pickup pointing to the start position of each stream object".

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of steps set forth in independent claims 1, 6 and 10 and the combinations of elements set forth in independent claims 15 and 18-20 are not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Saeki discloses an AV data management file including the PGC information and the VOB information (see FIG. 9). Saeki discloses that the PGC information is a table which includes a list of video sections in VOBs arranged in the reproduction order and that the information specifying the video section are called cells. Each cell specifies *a video section in a VOB* by *its start time and end time*. Each piece of PGC information shows logically linked video sections of AV data specified by the cells. (See col. 9, lines 57-64).

In other words, Saeki simply discloses a start time and end time of a video section of a VOB, i.e., *a partial portion of a VOB*. However, the start time of the partial portion of a VOB is not the information for pointing to the start position of a VOB. In the cell #1 of Saeki, a start time and an end time point to a certain position on a stream of the VOB, wherein only a part of the VOB stream can be played through the PGC. For example, in the event that a VOB is a video stream that starts from 10th min and lasts for 20 minutes, the start time (e.g., 20th min) and end time (e.g., 25th min) only enables reproduction of a video section from 20th to 25th min on the 20-min-long VOB.

Unlike Saeki, the present invention uses the index of a first stream object unit of each SOB for pointing to the *start position of a single SOB*, not just the start position of a partial portion of an SOB.

In addition, as mentioned in the last Amendment, Saeki uses the *relationships between the times and the storage positions of the VOBUs* in the VOB information (the time map information) to convert the *start time and end time* of the cells in the PGC information *to the start address and the end address* (see also Step 284 of FIG. 26; col. 19, lines 30-33). Therefore, Saeki's mechanism requires *two types of information*, i.e., PGC information and VOB information, and a complicated conversion or mapping from the times to the addresses of the data. Unlike Saeki's complicated conversion or mapping from the times to the addresses, the present invention *simply uses an index number* of a first stream object unit of each stream object to obtain the start position of the stream object. This feature is clearly absent from Saeki.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Moriyama, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to the time elapse information. This reference also fails to disclose

the above combinations of steps and elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 18-20. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Saeki.

Accordingly, neither of these references individually or in combination teaches or suggests at least the above features of amended independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 18-20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15 and 18-20 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) clearly define over the teachings of the utilized references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 21 and 22 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21 and 22 are allowable due to their respective dependence on independent claims 1 and 15, as well as due to the additional recitations included in these claims.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 21 and 22 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _Esther H. Chong_
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant